

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

Hino Motors Manufacturing  
U.S.A. Inc,

Plaintiff,

Civil Action No.: 20-10031  
Honorable Arthur J. Tarnow  
Magistrate Judge Elizabeth A. Stafford

v.

Boyer Consulting, LLC, *et*  
*al.*,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL  
FOR DEFENDANT CHRIS HETMAN AND  
TO ADJOURN PLAINTIFF'S PENDING MOTIONS (ECF NO. 43)**

Attorneys Daniel J. M. Schouman and David J. Kramer moved on behalf of themselves and their law firms to withdraw as counsel for Defendant Chris Hetman because of a breakdown in the attorney-client relationship. ECF No. 43. Counsel also requested that the Court adjourn the deadline for Hetman to respond to Hino Motors Manufacturing's motion for leave to file amended witness list, motion to seal, and motion for sanctions. ECF No. 37; ECF No. 38; ECF No. 40. After the Honorable Arthur J. Tarnow referred the motion to the undersigned, the Court held a hearing on May 26, 2021. ECF No. 44; ECF No. 45. Hetman attended the

hearing, concurred with the motion to withdraw, and asked for 60 days to secure new counsel. Hino's counsel requested that the Court grant Hetman a shorter period to find new counsel and that Hetman be given a 30-day adjournment to respond to the outstanding motions. The Court agrees that Hetman's request for 60 days to secure new counsel is too long, but finds that the short period Hino requests would not give new counsel enough time to make the reasonable inquiries required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(g).

The Court thus **GRANTS** the motion to withdraw, and **ORDERS** that Hetman secure new counsel by June 25, 2021. If he does not have new counsel then, he will need to represent himself. New counsel will have 30 days from the time of appearance to respond to Hino's outstanding motions. If Hetman does not find new counsel, he will need to file his own responses to the motions by July 26, 2021.

As the Court noted during the hearing, if Hetman does not comply with the discovery rules or court orders, he may face sanctions under Rule 26(g), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37, or the Court's inherent authority.

**IT IS ORDERED.**

s/Elizabeth A. Stafford  
ELIZABETH A. STAFFORD  
United States Magistrate Judge

Dated: May 26, 2021

**NOTICE TO PARTIES ABOUT OBJECTIONS**

Within 14 days of being served with this order, any party may file objections with the assigned district judge. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). The district judge may sustain an objection only if the order is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. 28 U.S.C. § 636. **“When an objection is filed to a magistrate judge’s ruling on a non-dispositive motion, the ruling remains in full force and effect unless and until it is stayed by the magistrate judge or a district judge.”** E.D. Mich. LR 72.2.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record and any unrepresented parties via the Court’s ECF System to their respective email or First Class U.S. mail addresses disclosed on the Notice of Electronic Filing on May 26, 2021.

s/Marlana Williams  
MARLENA WILLIAMS  
Case Manager